

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ISIDRO ROMAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

K. JACKSON

Defendant.

No. 1:23-cv-00671-KES-SAB (PC)

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATION AND DENYING
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO AMEND THE
COMPLAINT

Docs. 42, 44, 45, 49

Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter was referred to a United States magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On May 15, 2025, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations to deny plaintiff's motion to amend his second amended complaint, finding it would be prejudicial and cause undue delay, and finding that amendment would be futile as to certain claims. Doc. 49. The findings and recommendations were served on plaintiff and contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within fourteen (14) days after service. *Id.* at 8. Plaintiff filed objections on June 5, 2025, and defendant filed a reply on June 18, 2025. Docs. 52, 53.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the Court conducted a de novo review of this case. Plaintiff's objections do not identify any error in the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations. Having carefully reviewed the file, including plaintiff's


1 objections and defendant's reply, the Court concludes that the findings and recommendations are
2 supported by the record and proper analysis.

3 Accordingly:

- 4 1. The findings and recommendations issued on May 15, 2025, Doc. 49, are adopted in
5 full;
- 6 2. Plaintiff's motion for an extension of time, Doc. 42, is denied as moot; and
- 7 3. Plaintiff's motion to amend his second amended complaint, Doc. 44, is denied.

8
9
10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 Dated: August 24, 2025



UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE